

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-23 remain in the application. Claims 16-23 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, and 15 have been amended. New claims 24-30 have been added to the application.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, and 15 have been amended in order to avoid invoking 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. In particular, all instances of phrases such as --the steps of--, and -- the step of-- have been deleted. Applicant wishes to note for the record that the amendments are not intended to be narrowing, nor are the amendments being made for a reason related substantially to patentability. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added in the amendments.

Elections/Restrictions

Applicant affirms the provisional election without traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, claims 1-15. Applicant requests that claims 16-23 be cancelled from the application.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the indication of the allowability of claims 10-12.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-4, 7, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anderberg (WO 9608411 A1).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the feature "defining a parking position of the aircraft adjacent to the passenger loading bridge by positioning the aircraft-engaging end of the passenger loading bridge adjacent to a desired stopping location of the doorway of the aircraft." An example of support for the proposed amendment may be found in the application as originally filed at paragraph [0050], third through fifth lines, which states

“...one end of the passenger loading bridge is positioned at a desired location. In particular, the passenger loading bridge is adjusted such that the cab 6 is located adjacent to a desired final parking position for an aircraft.” Additionally, it is stated at paragraph 66 of the application as originally filed, “...the final parking position of the aircraft is dictated by the position of the aircraft-engaging end of the passenger loading bridge...” Accordingly, Applicant submits that no new matter has been added in the amendment.

Applicant respectfully submits that Anderberg does not teach, either expressly or inherently, each and every element as set forth at amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anderberg. In particular, Anderberg does not teach “**defining a parking position of the aircraft adjacent to the passenger loading bridge by positioning the aircraft-engaging end of the passenger loading bridge adjacent to a desired stopping location of the doorway of the aircraft.**” In fact, Anderberg merely teaches a method and apparatus for guiding a passenger bridge to a doorway of an aircraft based upon a known location of the door of the aircraft when the aircraft has come to a stop at an expected stopping position. This expected stopping position is **always the same** for a particular type of aircraft, every time that particular type of aircraft approaches the passenger bridge. Accordingly, in Anderberg, the position of the passenger bridge **does not** define the expected position of the aircraft when this has come to a halt at the stand 19. Rather, the particular type of aircraft is always guided to a same expected stopping position at the stand, **independently of the position of the passenger bridge** during the time that the aircraft is approaching the stand. Since this is the case, the passenger bridge may *optionally* be moved to an initial position of connection, based on the expected stopping position, in order to shorten the time it takes to connect the passenger bridge, as Anderberg teaches for example at page 3, lines 7-10. However, Applicant submits the aircraft will stop at the same expected stopping position even if the passenger bridge is not moved to the initial position of connection.

Applicant further submits that Anderberg does not teach “guiding the aircraft toward the aircraft-engaging end of the passenger loading bridge by providing a human intelligible indication for indicating the parking position of the aircraft...” At page 8, lines 13-20,

Anderberg teaches a distance meter (18), which aids the local computer 7 in monitoring the arrival of the plane 21. The local computer 7 uses signals from the distance meter 18 to confirm the type and stopping position of the aircraft 21. Since Anderberg states at page 2, lines 25-26 "...this connection of the passenger bridge does not require any operator at all," Applicant respectfully submits that Anderberg does not teach, either expressly or impliedly, "providing a human intelligible indication." In fact, Applicant respectfully submits that the signals from distance meter 18 are intelligible only to local computer 7, and that the signals are used for confirming the aircraft type and position rather than for guiding the aircraft toward the passenger bridge.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is in proper form for allowance.
Favorable reconsideration is kindly requested.

Amended claim 2 depends from believed allowable amended claim 1 and is also believed to be in proper form for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is kindly requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that Anderberg does not teach, either expressly or inherently, each and every element as set forth at claim 3. In particular, Anderberg does not teach "wherein the parking position of the aircraft is selected from a plurality of predetermined parking positions for a same type of aircraft at a same passenger loading bridge." At page 5, lines 19-20 Anderberg teaches storing "information on the expected stop **position** of the different aircraft models..." Anderberg does not use the plural form of the word "position", because each **different** aircraft model has **only one expected stop position**. Furthermore, Applicant agrees with the Examiner's statement at page 4, fifth-sixth lines from the bottom, "there is **an** expected position of the aircraft." Accordingly, Anderberg does not teach selecting a parking position from a plurality of predetermined parking positions for a same type of aircraft at a same passenger loading bridge. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3, which depends from believed allowable amended claim 1, is also in proper form for allowance.

Amended claims 4-6 depend from believed allowable amended claim 1 and are also believed to be in proper form for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is kindly requested.

Claim 7 has been amended in order to more clearly define that subject matter which Applicant considers to be the invention. No new matter has been added in the amendment.

Applicant respectfully submits that Anderberg does not teach, either expressly or inherently, each and every element as set forth at amended claim 7. Accordingly, Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anderberg. In particular, Anderberg does not teach “providing a human intelligible indication for indicating the desired parking position of the aircraft, the human intelligible indication being dependent upon the position of the aircraft-engaging end of the passenger loading bridge, such that substantially varying the position of the aircraft-engaging end of the passenger loading bridge results in a substantial variation in the parking position of the aircraft.” As discussed *supra* with reference to amended claim 1, Anderberg merely teaches a method and apparatus for guiding a passenger bridge to a doorway of an aircraft based upon a known location of the door of the aircraft when the aircraft has come to a stop at an expected stopping position. Applicant respectfully submits this expected stopping position is **always the same** for a particular type of aircraft, every time that particular type of aircraft approaches the passenger bridge. Accordingly, substantially varying the position of the aircraft-engaging end of the passenger bridge has **absolutely no effect** on the parking position of the aircraft in the system of Anderberg. Furthermore, also as discussed *supra*, Anderberg does not teach “providing a human intelligible indication for indicating the desired parking position of the aircraft.” At page 8, lines 13-20, Anderberg teaches a distance meter (18), which aids the local computer 7 in monitoring the arrival of the plane 21. The local computer 7 uses signals from the distance meter 18 to confirm the type and stopping position of the aircraft 21. Since Anderberg states at page 2, lines 25-26 “...this connection of the passenger bridge does not require any operator at all,” Applicant respectfully submits that Anderberg does not teach, either expressly or impliedly, “providing a human intelligible indication.” In fact, Applicant respectfully submits that the signals from distance meter 18 are intelligible only to local computer 7, and that the signals are used for confirming the aircraft type and position rather than for guiding the aircraft toward the passenger bridge.

Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 7 is in proper form for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is kindly requested.

Amended claims 8-10 depend from believed allowable amended claim 7 and are also believed to be in proper form for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is kindly requested.

Claims 11-12 depend from believed allowable amended claim 7 and are also believed to be allowable. Favorable reconsideration is kindly requested.

Amended claim 13 depends from believed allowable amended claim 7 and is also believed to be in proper form for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is kindly requested.

Claim 14 depends from believed allowable amended claim 7 and is also believed to be in proper form for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is kindly requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that Anderberg does not teach, either expressly or inherently, each and every element as set forth at amended claim 15. Accordingly, Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anderberg. In particular, Anderberg does not teach “selecting a desired parking position for the determined type of the aircraft from a plurality of allowed parking positions for the determined type of the aircraft in the vicinity of the passenger loading bridge.” At page 5, lines 19-20 Anderberg teaches storing “information on the expected stop **position** of the different aircraft models...” Anderberg does not use the plural form of position, because each **different** aircraft model has **only one expected stop position**. Furthermore, Applicant agrees with the Examiner’s statement at page 7, first-second lines, “there is **an** expected position of the aircraft.” Accordingly, Anderberg does not teach selecting a desired parking position for the determined type of the aircraft from a plurality of allowed parking positions for the determined type of the aircraft in the vicinity of the passenger loading bridge.

Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 15 is in proper form for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is kindly requested.

Claims 16-23 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

Claims 5, 6, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderberg (WO 9608411 A1).

Having regard to amended claims 5 and 8, Applicant respectfully submits that extending the passenger loading bridge a distance of between 0.5 meters and 3 meters, when combined with all the limitations recited at amended claims 1 and 7, respectively, defines a patentable advance in the art over the teachings of Anderberg. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 5 and 8, which depend from believed allowable amended claims 1 and 7, respectively, are also in proper form for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is kindly requested.

Having regard to amended claims 6 and 9, Applicant respectfully submits that extending the passenger loading bridge a distance of less than 1 meter, when combined with all the limitations recited at amended claims 1 and 7, respectively, defines a patentable advance in the art over the teachings of Anderberg. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 6 and 9, which depend indirectly from believed allowable amended claims 1 and 7, respectively, are also in proper form for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is kindly requested.

New Claims

New claim 24 has been added to the application. An example of support for new claim 24 may be found at original claim 10, which depends directly from original claim 7. Applicant submits that new claim 24 is allowable since it includes all of the limitations as originally recited at objected to claim 10 and all of the limitations of the base claim. Favorable reconsideration is kindly requested.

New claims 25-26 have been added to the application. Examples of support for new claims 25 and 26 may be found in the application as originally filed at original claims 11 and 12, respectively. Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 25-26, which depend from

believed allowable new claim 24, are also in proper form for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is kindly requested.

New claim 27 has been added to the application. An example of support for new claim 27 may be found in the application as originally filed at paragraph [0056], and at original claim 2. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 27, which depends from believed allowable new claim 24, is also in allowable form. Favorable reconsideration is kindly requested.

New claim 28 has been added to the application. An example of support for new claim 28 may be found in the application as originally filed at original claim 3. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 28, which depends from believed allowable new claim 24, is also in allowable form. Favorable reconsideration is kindly requested.

New claim 29 has been added to the application. An example of support for new claim 29 may be found in the application as originally filed at paragraph [0058], and at original claim 8. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 29, which depends from believed allowable new claim 24, is also in allowable form. Favorable reconsideration is kindly requested.

New claim 30 has been added to the application. An example of support for new claim 30 may be found in the application as originally filed at paragraph [0056], and at original claim 9. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 30, which depends from believed allowable new claim 24, is also in allowable form. Favorable reconsideration is kindly requested.

No new matter has been added in the amended claims.

Applicant looks forward to favourable reconsideration of the present application.

Appl. No. 10/627,778
Reply to Official Action mailed on January 13, 2004

**Please charge any additional fees required or credit any overpayment to Deposit
Account No: 50-1142.**

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'G Fre', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Gordon Freedman, Reg. No. 41,553

Freedman & Associates
117 CentrepoinTE Drive, Suite 350
Nepean, Ontario K2G 5X3 Canada

Tel: (613) 274-7272
Fax: (613) 274-7414
E-mail: gordon@freedmanandassociates.ca

MW/bh